

FILED  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
**JAN 03, 2025**  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
BY  PD  DEPUTY  
DOCUMENT SUBMITTED THROUGH THE  
ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT SUBMISSION SYSTEM

David Stebbins (pro se Plaintiff)  
(870) 212-4947

123 W. Ridge Ave., APT D, Harrison, AR 72601  
[acerthorn@yahoo.com](mailto:acerthorn@yahoo.com)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID STEBBINS,

PLAINTIFF

VS.

Case 8:24-cv-01486-JVS-KES

JARROD JONES

DEFENDANTS

**NOTICE OF APPEAL REGARDING ECF 119, ORDER**  
**DENYING MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL**

Comes now, pro se Plaintiff David Stebbins, who hereby submits the following Notice of Appeal regarding ECF 119, Order Denying Motion to Appoint Counsel.

The court committed the following reversible errors:

1. First it erred when it found that I did not have a constitutional right to appointment of counsel in all matters which are presumptively criminal in nature.
2. Second, it erred when it found that the only matters at issue were whether I had made a false statement. This is not the law. The relevant consideration is whether my statements had evidentiary support, which is exponentially more complex than simply whether they were true.
3. In addition, binding precedent holds that sanctions cannot issue unless the Court finds that I made a *knowing* misrepresentation. See *Golden Eagle Distributing Corp. v. Burroughs Corp.*, 801 F. 2d 1531, 1540-41 (9th Cir. 1986). This makes the factual determination even more complex than simply whether or not I had made a statement that was false in the first instance.
4. Not only that, but the question of whether a fine of \$1,500 is an “excessive fine” in violation of my Eighth Amendment and due process rights is also a relevant consideration, which makes the matter that much more complex.

So notified on this, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of January, 2025.



David Stebbins (pro se)